Exhibit 1



null / ALL Transmittal Number: 13574309 Date Processed: 03/16/2015

Notice of Service of Process

Primary Contact: Service Process Team 1-30-403

Nationwide Insurance One Nationwide Plaza Columbus, OH 43215

Copy of transmittal only provided to: Rebecca Lewis

Kevin Jones Cassandra Struble

Entity: Nationwide Property And Casualty Insurance Company

Entity ID Number 3286574

Entity Served: Nationwide Property and Casualty Insurance Company

Title of Action: Francisco Saenz aka Frank Saenz vs. Nationwide Property and Casualty

Insurance Company

Document(s) Type: Citation/Petition

Nature of Action: Property

Court/Agency: Hidalgo County District Court, Texas

Case/Reference No: C-0928-15-H

Jurisdiction Served: Texas

Date Served on CSC: 03/16/2015

Answer or Appearance Due: 10:00 am Monday next following the expiration of 20 days after service

Originally Served On: CSC

How Served: Personal Service
Sender Information: Nishi Kothari
281-532-5529

Information contained on this transmittal form is for record keeping, notification and forwarding the attached document(s). It does not constitute a legal opinion. The recipient is responsible for interpreting the documents and taking appropriate action.

To avoid potential delay, please do not send your response to CSC

CSC is SAS70 Type II certified for its Litigation Management System.

2711 Centerville Road Wilmington, DE 19808 (888) 690-2882 | sop@cscinfo.com

Case 7:15-cv-00134 Document 1-1 Filed in TXSD on 04/92/151 Page 3 of

C-0928-15-H 389TH DISTRICT COURT, HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS

CITATION

STATE OF TEXAS

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: You have been sued. You may employ an attorney. If you or your attorney do not file a written answer with the clerk who issued this citation by 10:00 a.m. on the Monday next following the expiration of twenty (20) days after you were served with this citation and petition, a default judgment may be taken against you.

NATIONWIDE PROPERTY AND CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY BY SERVING ITS ATTORNEY: C T CORPORATION SYSTEM 350 NORTH ST. PAUL STREET DALLAS, TEXAS 75201

You are hereby commanded to appear by filing a written answer to the PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL PETITION on or before 10:00 o'clock a.m. on the Monday next after the expiration of twenty (20) days after the date of service hereof, before the Honorable Letty Lopez, 389th District Court of Hidalgo County, Texas at the Courthouse at 100 North Closner, Edinburg, Texas 78539.

Said petition was filed on this the 3rd day of March, 2015 and a copy of same accompanies this citation. The file number and style of said suit being C-0928-15-H, FRANCISCO SAENZ AKA FRANK SAENZ V. NATIONWIDE PROPERTY AND CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY

Said Petition was filed in said court by NISHI KOTHARI, 1110 NASA PKWY., STE. 620 HOUSTON, TX 77058.

The nature of the demand is fully shown by a true and correct copy of the petition accompanying this citation and made a part hereof.

The officer executing this writ shall promptly serve the same according to requirements of law, and the mandates thereof, and make due return as the law directs.

ISSUED AND GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL of said Court at Edinburg, Texas on this the 4th day of March, 2015.

LAURA HINOJOSA, DISTRICT CLERK HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS

CLAUDIA I. RODRIGUEZ, DEPUTY CLERK

C-0928-15-H OFFICER'S RETURN

Came to hand on o	f	, 201	l at	o'clock	m. and
executed in	_ County, To	exas by del	ivering to e	each of the	within named
Defendant in person, a tru					
delivery to said Defer					
	(pe	tition) at th	e following	times and p	laces, to-wit:
			·		
NAME	DATE	TIME	PLACE		
And not executed as to the	defendant,				the
diligence used in finding	said defenda	nt, being:			and the
cause of failure to execution information received a	ute this pro	cess is: _			and the
information received a	s to the	whereabo	uts of s	said defen	dant, being:
	I actually	and neces	sarily trave	led	miles in the
service of this citation, in a				ave traveled	in the service
of other process in the same	e case during	the same tri	p.		
Food coming comits)					
Fees: serving copy(s) \$ miles\$					
mics					
DEPUTY					
COMPLETE IF	YOU ARE P	ERSON O	THER THA	AN A SHEF	riff,
	TABLE OR				•
In accordance to Rule 107	, the officer	or authoriz	ed person v	who serves	or attempts to
serve a citation must sign					
sheriff, constable or the cle	erk of the cou	rt, the retur	n must eithe	er be verifie	d or be signed
under the penalty of perjur				f perjury mu	ist contain the
statement below in substan	tially the follo	owing form:	, •		
60 A				mu data	of himb is
"My name is and the	address is		······································	my date	I has
declare under penalty of pe	rivery that the	foregoing i	s true and co	orrect	,and i
deciate under penaity of pe	ijury mac me	roregoing i	s a de dire e	Direct.	
EXECUTED in	County, State	of Texas.	on the	day of _	3
201				y	
•					
Declarant"					
If Certified by the Supre	na Court of	Pavas			
Date of Expiration / SCH		LVAGS			

CAUSE NG-0928-15-H

FRANCISCO SAENZ AKA FRANK	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
SAENZ,	8	•
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS,
	§	
NATIONWIDE PROPERTY AND	§	
CASUALTY INSURANCE	8	
COMPANY,	8	•
Defendant.	§	TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL PETITION

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

COMES NOW, Francisco Saenz aka Frank Saenz, ("Plaintiff" or "Saenz"), and files this Plaintiff's Original Petition, complaining of Nationwide Property & Casualty Insurance Company ("Nationwide") and respectfully show this Honorable Court the following:

DISCOVERY CONTROL PLAN

Plaintiff intends for discovery to be conducted under Level 3 of Rule 190 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. This case involves complex issues and will require extensive discovery. Therefore, Plaintiff requests the Court to order that discovery be conducted in accordance with a discovery control plan tailored to the particular circumstances of this suit.

PARTIES

- Plaintiff Francisco Saenz, commonly referred to as Frank Saenz, is an individual residing in Hidalgo County, Texas.
- 3. Defendant Nationwide is a foreign insurance company engaged in the business of insurance in Texas, with its principal office located in Columbus, Ohio. The causes of action asserted

C-0928-15-H

arose from or are connected with purposeful acts committed by Defendant. Nationwide may be served via its registered attorney for service, C T Corporation System, at 350 North St. Paul Street, Dallas, Texas 75201.

JURISDICTION

- 4. The Court has jurisdiction over this cause of action because the amount in controversy is within the jurisdictional limits of the Court. Plaintiff is seeking monetary relief between \$200,000 1,000,000.00. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend his petition during and/or after the discovery process.
- 5. The Court has jurisdiction over Defendant Nationwide because this defendant engages in the business of insurance in the State of Texas, and Plaintiff's causes of action arise out of this defendant's business activities in the State of Texas.

VENUE

6. Venue is proper in Hidalgo County, Texas, because the insured property is situated in Hidalgo County, Texas. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §15.032.

FACTS

- 7. Plaintiff is the owner of a Texas Homeowners' Insurance Policy (hereinafter referred to as "the Policy"), which was issued by Nationwide.
- Plaintiff owns the insured property, which is specifically located 2015 Point West Drive,
 Edinburg, Texas, in Hidalgo County (hereinafter referred to as "the Property").
- 9. Nationwide sold the Policy insuring the Property to Plaintiff under policy number 612933.
- 10. On or about April 20, 2012, a hail storm and/or windstorm struck Hidalgo County, Texas, causing severe damage to homes and businesses throughout the area, including Plaintiff's residence ("the Storm"). Specifically, Plaintiff's roof sustained extensive damage during

C-0928-15-H

the storm. Water intrusion through the roof caused damage throughout the home including, but not limited to, the ceilings, walls, insulation, and fixtures of the Property's garage, and bathroom. Plaintiff's home also sustained exterior damage during the storm, including but not limited to damage to wood siding, soffits, fascia, exterior doors, garage, two sheds, and wood fence.

- 11. Plaintiff submitted a claim to Nationwide against the Policy as referenced in paragraph 9 above, for Roof Damage, Exterior Damage, and Water Damage the Property sustained as a result of the hail storm and/or windstorm, under claim number 7842HO612933.
- 12. Plaintiff asked that Nationwide cover the cost of repairs to the Property, including but not limited to, repair and/or replacement of the roof and repair of the exterior damage and interior water damages to the Property, pursuant to the Policy.
- 13. Defendant Nationwide assigned Michael Otto ("Mr. Otto") to adjust the claim. Mr. Otto was improperly trained and/or supervised and failed to perform a thorough investigation of Plaintiff's claim. Specifically, Mr. Otto conducted a substandard inspection of Plaintiff's property. The inadequacy of Mr. Otto's inspection is evidenced by his report, which failed to include the majority of Plaintiff's damages. Ultimately, Mr. Otto's estimate did not allow adequate funds to cover the cost of repairs for many of the damages sustained. Mr. Otto's inadequate investigation was relied upon by Nationwide in this action and resulted in Plaintiff's claim being improperly denied.
- 14. Defendant Nationwide failed to adequately train and supervise Mr. Otto resulting in the unreasonable investigation and improper handling of Plaintiff's claim. Moreover, Nationwide failed to thoroughly review and properly oversee the work of Mr. Otto, ultimately approving an improper adjustment of and an inadequate, unfair settlement of

C-0928-15-H

Plaintiff's claim. As a result of Defendant's wrongful acts and omissions set forth above and further described herein, Plaintiff's claims were improperly denied causing him to suffer damages.

- 15. Defendant Nationwide set about to deny and/or underpay on properly covered damages. Nationwide misrepresented to Plaintiff that Mr. Otto's estimate included all of Plaintiff's properly covered hail storm and/or windstorm damages and made sufficient allowances to cover the cost of repairs to Plaintiff's Property pursuant to the Policy when, in fact, the estimate failed to include many of Plaintiff's properly covered storm damages and failed to allow for sufficient amounts to cover the cost of repairs to Plaintiff's Property.

 Defendant Nationwide failed to provide any coverage for the damages sustained by Plaintiff and under-scoped and undervalued Plaintiff's damages, thereby denying payment on Plaintiff's claim. As a result of this Defendant's unreasonable investigation, Plaintiff's claim was improperly adjusted and Plaintiff has been severely underpaid and suffered damages. The mishandling of Plaintiff's claim has also caused a delay in Plaintiff's ability to fully repair his Property, which has resulted in additional damages. To this date, Plaintiff has yet to receive sufficient payment that he is entitled to under the Policy.
- 16. As detailed in the paragraphs below, Nationwide wrongfully denied Plaintiff's claim for repairs of the Property, even though the Policy provided coverage for losses such as those suffered by Plaintiff. Furthermore, Nationwide undervalued some of Plaintiff's claims by not providing full coverage for the damages sustained by Plaintiff, as well as underscoping the damages during its investigation.

C-0928-15-H

- To date, Nationwide continues to delay in the payment for the damages to the property.As such, Plaintiff has not been paid in full for the damages to his home.
- 18. Defendant Nationwide failed to perform its contractual duty to adequately compensate Plaintiff under the terms of the Policy. Specifically, it refused to pay many of the proceeds of the Policy, although due demand was made for proceeds to be paid in an amount sufficient to cover the damaged property. Nationwide's conduct constitutes a breach of the insurance contract between Nationwide and Plaintiff.
- 19. Defendant Nationwide misrepresented to Plaintiff that the damage to the Property was not covered under the Policy, even though the damage was caused by a covered occurrence. Defendant Nationwide's conduct constitutes violations of the Texas Insurance Code, Unfair Settlement Practices. Tex. Ins. Code §541.060(a)(1).
- 20. Nationwide failed to make an attempt to settle Plaintiff's claim in a fair manner, although it as aware of its liability to Plaintiff under the Policy. Nationwide's conduct constitutes a violation of the Texas Insurance Code, Unfair Settlement Practices. Tex. Ins. Code §541.060(a)(2)(A).
- 21. Nationwide failed to explain to Plaintiff the reasons for its denial of Plaintiff's claim. Specifically, Nationwide failed to offer Plaintiff adequate compensation, without any explanation why full payment was not being made. Furthermore, Nationwide did not communicate that any future settlements or payments would be forthcoming to pay for the losses covered under the Policy, nor did it provide any explanation for the failure to

C-0928-15-H

- adequately settle Plaintiff's claim. The conduct of Nationwide is a violation of the Texas Insurance Code, Unfair Settlement Practices. Tex. INS. Code §541.060(a)(3).
- 22. Defendant Nationwide failed to affirm or deny coverage of Plaintiff's claim within a reasonable time. Specifically, Plaintiff did not receive timely indication of acceptance or rejection, regarding the full and entire claim, in writing from Nationwide. The conduct of Nationwide constitutes a violation of the Texas Insurance Code, Unfair Settlement Practices. Tex. Ins. Code §541.060(a)(4).
- 23. Defendant Nationwide refused to fully compensate Plaintiff, under the terms of the Policy, even though Nationwide failed to conduct a reasonable investigation. Specifically, Nationwide performed an outcome-oriented investigation of Plaintiff's claim, which resulted in a biased, unfair, and inequitable evaluation of Plaintiff's losses on the Property. The conduct of Nationwide constitutes a violation of the Texas Insurance Code, Unfair Settlement Practices. Tex. Ins. Code §541.060(a)(7).
- 24. Defendant Nationwide failed to meet its obligations under the Texas Insurance Code regarding timely acknowledging Plaintiff's claim, beginning an investigation of Plaintiff's claim, and requesting all information reasonably necessary to investigate Plaintiff's claim, within the statutorily mandated time of receiving notice of Plaintiff's claim. Nationwide's conduct constitutes a violation of the Texas Insurance Code, Prompt Payment of Claims. Tex. Ins. Code §542.055.
- 25. Defendant Nationwide failed to accept or deny Plaintiff's full and entire claim within the statutorily mandated time of receiving all necessary information. Nationwide's conduct

C-0928-15-H

- constitutes a violation of the Texas Insurance Code, Prompt Payment of Claims. Tex. Ins. Code §542.056.
- 26. Defendant Nationwide failed to meet its obligations under the Texas Insurance Code regarding payment of claim without delay. Specifically, it has delayed full payment of Plaintiff's claim longer than allowed and, to date, Plaintiff has not received full payment for their claim. Nationwide's conduct constitutes a violation of the Texas Insurance Code, Prompt Payment of Claims. Tex. Ins. Code §542.058.
- 27. From and after the time Plaintiff's claim was presented to Defendant Nationwide, the liability of Nationwide to pay the full claim in accordance with the terms of the Policy was reasonably clear. However, Nationwide has refused to pay Plaintiff in full, despite there being no basis whatsoever on which a reasonable insurance company would have relied to deny the full payment. Nationwide's conduct constitutes a breach of the common law duty of good faith and fair dealing.
- 28. Defendant Nationwide knowingly or recklessly made false representations, as described above, as to material facts and/or knowingly concealed all or part of material information from Plaintiff.
- 29. As a result of Defendant Nationwide's wrongful acts and omissions, Plaintiff was forced to retain the professional services of the attorney and law firm who are representing them with respect to these causes of action.

CAUSES OF ACTION:

30. Defendant Nationwide is liable to Plaintiff for intentional breach of contract, as well as intentional violations of the Texas Insurance Code, and intentional breach of the common law duty of good faith and fair dealing.

C-0928-15-H

BREACH OF CONTRACT

- 31. Defendant Nationwide's conduct constitutes a breach of the insurance contract made between Nationwide and Plaintiff.
- 32. Defendant Nationwide's failure and/or refusal, as described above, to pay the adequate compensation as it is obligated to do under the terms of the Policy in question, and under the laws of the State of Texas, constitutes a breach of Nationwide's insurance contract with Plaintiff.

Noncompliance with Texas Insurance Code: Unfair Settlement Practices

- 33. Defendant Nationwide's conduct constitutes multiple violations of the Texas Insurance Code, Unfair Settlement Practices. Tex. Ins. Code §541.060(a). All violations under this article are made actionable by Tex. Ins. Code §541.151.
- 34. Defendant Nationwide's unfair settlement practice, as described above, of misrepresenting to Plaintiff material facts relating to the coverage at issue, constitutes an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in the business of insurance. Tex. INS. CODE §541.060(a)(1).
- 35. Defendant Nationwide's unfair settlement practice, as described above, of failing to attempt in good faith to effectuate a prompt, fair, and equitable settlement of the claim, even though Nationwide's liability under the Policy was reasonably clear, constitutes an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in the business of insurance. Tex. Ins. Code §541.060(a)(2)(A).
- 36. Defendant Nationwide's unfair settlement practice, as described above, of failing to promptly provide Plaintiff with a reasonable explanation of the basis in the Policy, in relation to the facts or applicable law, for its offer of a compromise settlement of the claim,

C-0928-15-H

- constitutes an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in the business of insurance. Tex. Ins. Code §541.060(a)(3).
- 37. Defendant Nationwide's unfair settlement practice, as described above, of failing within a reasonable time to affirm or deny coverage of the claim to Plaintiff, or to submit a reservation of rights to Plaintiff, constitutes an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in the business of insurance. Tex. Ins. Code §541.060(a)(4).
- 38. Defendant Nationwide's unfair settlement practice, as described above, of refusing to pay Plaintiff's claim without conducting a reasonable investigation, constitutes an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in the business of insurance. Tex. Ins. Code §541.060(a)(7).

NONCOMPLIANCE WITH TEXAS INSURANCE CODE: THE PROMPT PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

- 39. Defendant Nationwide's conduct constitutes multiple violations of the Texas Insurance Code, Prompt Payment of Claims. All violations made under this article are made actionable by Tex. Ins. Code §542.060.
- 40. Defendant Nationwide's failure to acknowledge receipt of Plaintiff's claim, commence investigation of the claim, and request from Plaintiff all items, statements, and forms that it reasonably believed would be required within the applicable time constraints, as described above, constitutes a non-prompt payment of claims and a violation of Tex. INS. Code §542.055.
- 41. Defendant Nationwide's failure to notify Plaintiff in writing of its acceptance or rejection of the claim within the applicable time constraints, constitutes a non-prompt payment of the claim. Tex. INS. Code §542.056.

C-0928-15-H

42. Defendant Nationwide's delay of the payment of Plaintiff's claim following its receipt of all items, statements, and forms reasonably requested and required, longer than the amount of time provided for, as described above, constitutes a non-prompt payment of the claim.

Tex. Ins. Code §542.058.

BREACH OF THE DUTY OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING

- 43. Defendant Nationwide's conduct constitutes a breach of the common law duty of good faith and fair dealing owed to insureds in insurance contracts.
- 44. "Good faith and fair dealing" is defined as the degree and diligence which a man of ordinary care and prudence would exercise in the management of one's own business.

 Arnold v. Nat'l Mut. Fir Ins. Co., 725 S.W.2d 165, 167 (Tex. 1987). This tort arises from Texas law, which recognizes that a special relationship exists as a result of Plaintiff's (the policyholder) and Nationwide's (the insurer) unequal bargaining power. Part of this unequal bargaining power results from the fact that Nationwide, like other insurers, controls entirely the evaluation, processing and denial of claims.
- 45. At the time of Mr. Otto's inspection and/or investigation, upon which Nationwide relied entirely for its investigation, evaluation, and settling of Plaintiff's claim, Mr. Otto tried to wrongfully at least partially deny Plaintiff's losses. By not accounting for the covered damages Defendant Nationwide did not inspect and evaluate Plaintiff's home as if it were their own home. Defendant Nationwide's investigation and evaluation was not reasonable, thus, Nationwide lacked a reasonable basis for denying or only partially including payment for Plaintiff's covered damages. Nationwide's overall conduct in handling Plaintiff's claim was not reasonable.

C-0928-15-H

46. Defendant Nationwide's failure, as described above, to adequately and reasonably investigate and evaluate Plaintiff's claim, although, at that time, Defendant Nationwide knew or should have known by the exercise of reasonable diligence that its liability was reasonably clear, constitutes a breach of the duty of good faith and fair dealing.

KNOWLEDGE

47. Each of the acts described above, together and singularly, was done "knowingly," as that term is used in the Texas Insurance Code, and was a producing cause of Plaintiff's damages described herein.

DAMAGES

- 48. Plaintiff would show that all of the aforementioned acts, taken together or singularly, constitute the producing causes of the damages sustained by Plaintiff.
- 49. As previously mentioned, the damages caused by the April 20, 2012, hail storm and/or windstorm have not been properly addressed or repaired in the months since the storm, causing further damages to the Property, and causing undue hardship and burden to Plaintiff. These damages are a direct result of Defendant Nationwide's mishandling of Plaintiff's claim in violation of the laws set forth above.
- 50. For breach of contract, Plaintiff is entitled to regain the benefit of his bargain, which is the amount of his claim, together with attorney's fees.
- 51. For noncompliance with the Texas Insurance Code, Unfair Settlement Practices, Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages, which include the loss of the benefits that should have been paid pursuant to the policy, mental anguish, court costs, and attorney's fees. For knowing conduct of the acts described above, Plaintiff asks for three times his actual damages. Tex. Ins. Code §541.152.

C-0928-15-H

- 52. For noncompliance with Texas Insurance Code, Prompt Payment of Claims, Plaintiff is entitled to the amount of his claim, as well as eighteen (18) percent interest per annum on the amount of such claim as damages, together with attorney's fees. Tex. Ins. Code §542.060.
- 53. For breach of the common law duty of good faith and fair dealing, Plaintiff is entitled to compensatory damages, including all forms of loss resulting from the insurer's breach of duty, such as additional costs, economic hardship, losses due to nonpayment of the amount the insurer owed, exemplary damages, and damages for emotional distress.
- 54. For the prosecution and collection of this claim, Plaintiff has been compelled to engage the services of the attorney whose name is subscribed to this pleading. Therefore, Plaintiff is entitled to recover a sum for the reasonable and necessary services of Plaintiff's attorney in the preparation and trial of this action, including any appeals to the Court of Appeals and/or the Supreme Court of Texas.

STANDING ORDERS

- 55. This matter will be governed by the Standing Pretrial Order Concerning Hidalgo County Residential Hail Claims. Pursuant to the Court's Order, a copy is attached to *Plaintiff's Original Petition* as "Exhibit 1."
- 56. The Order Assigning Cases for Pretrial Matters Concerning Hidalgo County Residential and Commercial Hail Claims is attached to *Plaintiff's Original Petition* as "Exhibit 2."

REQUEST FOR DISCLOSURE

57. Under Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 194, Plaintiff hereby requests Defendant Nationwide disclose, within fifty (50) days of service of this request, the information or material described in Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 194.2 (a) through (l).

C-0928-15-H

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Plaintiff prays that upon trial hereof, said Plaintiff have and recover such sums as would reasonably and justly compensate him in accordance with the rules of law and procedure, as to actual damages, treble damages under the Texas Insurance Code, and all punitive and exemplary damages as may be found. In addition, Plaintiff request the award of attorney's fees for the trial and any appeal of this case, for all costs of Court on his behalf expended, for prejudgment and post-judgment interest as allowed by law, and for any other and further relief, either at law or in equity, to which he may show himself justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

ARGUELLO, MOPE & ASSOCIATES, P.L.L.C.

Nishi Kothari

State Bar of Texas Number: 24087862

David A. Christoffel

State Bar of Texas Number: 24065044

1110 NASA Parkway, Suite 620

Houston, Texas 77058 Telephone: (281) 532-5529 Facsimile: (281)402-3534

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

FRANCISCO SAENZ AKA FRANK SAENZ

EXHIBIT NO. 1

IN RE:	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
HIDALGO HAIL	§ §	
RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY	8	HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS
CLAIM LITIGATION	§ §	TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

STANDING PRETRIAL ORDER CONCERNING HIDALGO COUNTY RESIDENTIAL HAIL CLAIMS

It is hereby ORDERED that the 93rd, 206th and 370th District Courts of Hidalgo County, Texas, have been appointed as the Consolidated Pretrial Courts over Hidalgo Hail Litigation filed in District Court in Hidalgo County, Texas. The 93rd, 206th and 370th District Courts of Hidalgo County, Texas, have been assigned to handle all pretrial matters for residential property insurance cases filed in the District Courts of Hidalgo County, Texas that involve insurance disputes arising out of hail storms that struck Hidalgo County on or about March 29, 2012 and April 20, 2012.

IT IS ACCORDINGLY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

- A. This Order shall be affective and apply to all lawsnits filed in the District Court of Hidalgo County, Texas wherein any policyholder (the "Plaintiff Insured") asserts a claim arising from damage to residential property caused by the 2012 Hail Storms that struck Hidalgo County on or about March 29, 2012 and April 20, 2012, against an insurance carrier who issues insurance policies for residential property (the "Residential Insurance Carrier"); and
- B. Immediately upon the filing of this Order, the District Clerk shall post this Order on the Hidalgo County District Courts' website. Any Plaintiff who is aware of this Order shall attach a copy of this Order to its Original Petition, or to otherwise send a copy of this Order to any party, if pro se, or to such party's counsel of record.
- C. Within one hundred (100) days after the Residential Insurance Carrier makes an appearance in the lawsuit or the date of this Order, whichever is later, all parties are Ordered to agree on a mediator and mediation date. However, the mediation can be set to occur outside of this time period. Once the parties have agreed on a mediator and mediation date, they shall notify the Court by filing the attached Mediation Order (Exhibit "A"). If the parties make an agreement around the timing in this provision, the parties must obtain approval of their agreement from the Court
- D. Immediately upon the filing of the Residential Insurance Carrier's Original Answer, the case will be abated until (1) 30 days after unsuccessful mediation or (2) notice by any party that the party desires to unilaterally end the abatement period applicable to a particular case 30 days from the date the notice is received by the opposing party. The abatement period will apply to all Court ordered deadlines or Rule 190 Discovery

deadlines. The abatement period will not apply to any statutory deadline, interest or penalties that may apply under any statutory code or law. The parties may send written discovery during the abatement time period, however, the responses and objections to those discovery requests will not be due until 30 days after the earlier of an unsuccessful mediation or a party's termination of the abatement period.

- E, Furthermore, within 60 days of the filing of the Insurance Carrier's Original Answer or the date of this Order, whichever is later, the parties will use their best efforts to exchange information and documentation pertaining to the residence, to the extent same exists, including the following: Expert Reports, Engineering Reports, Estimates of Damage or repairs; Contents Lists for contents damage claim; Photographs; Repair Receipts or Invoices; the non-privileged portions of the Residential Insurance Carrier and Adjusting Company's claims file (including all claim diary notes, activity logs, loss notes and email correspondence regarding the insurance claim); payment ledger, payment log and/or proof of payment from the Insurance Carrier: a copy of the insurance policy in effect at the time of the respective Hail claim(s); and the non-privileged portions of the underwriting file. If the Insurance Carrier is not in possession of the Adjusting Company's/Adjuster's claims file, and the Adjusting Company/Adjuster is not a named as a party in the lawsuit represented by separate counsel, then the Insurance Carrier shall seek the Adjusting Company's claims file and use their best efforts to exchange this information within the 60 day time period. The Insurance Carrier is also Ordered to notify the independent adjusting company that all emails, activity notes and loss diary notes pertaining to the Hail claim in litigation shall be preserved and not destroyed pursuant to the Court's "Save & Hold" directive regarding those emails and claims correspondence. Lastly, a privilege log will also be produced in accordance with the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure for any redactions or privileges being asserted on any documents in the claims file or claim correspondence.
- P. Any Expert Reports, Engineering Reports, Contractor Estimates or any other estimates of damages or repairs obtained by directive of Counsel for settlement, demand, or mediation purposes and exchanged prior to mediation shall be for "Mediation Purposes Only" and shall be considered confidential, except that any estimates and/or reports that are part of the claims file, which were obtained or prepared during the claims handling, shall not be considered confidential under this paragraph. Otherwise, such reports and estimates exchanged for mediation purposes shall only be used at trial if Plaintiff or Defendant designates the consultant as a retained testifying expert and does not properly dedesignate prior to trial. If a consultant, whose report is produced at mediation, produces a subsequent report for use at trial, the mediation report shall remain confidential unless agreed to otherwise. The reports and estimates are only confidential for the lawsuit in which they are being used. Expert reports designated for mediation purposes shall be returned to the providing party within 14 days of a written request by the providing party for their return after mediation. Such reports shall not be discoverable or admissible at trial or any hearing. If the party procuring the report designates the expert to testify, such party shall have the right to prevent discovery or testimony by the expert regarding the mediation report and any opinions therein. The procuring party may use data such as measurements and photographs without walving this privilege. Nothing herein shall

- prohibit the use of those reports and estimates in any subsequent insurance claims or lawsuits involving the same Residential Insurance Carrier.
- G. Once a mediation date and mediator are agreed to by all parties, the Residential Insurance Carrier shall be permitted to inspect the residence involved in the lawsuit (as soon as practicable) prior to mediation. If mediation is unsuccessful, the Residential Insurance Carrier and other Defendants may reinspect the residence with the same, new or additional experts pursuant to the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.
- H. The Mediator shall notify the Court within 48 hours once an impasse has been declared by the Mediator. This notice shall be in writing and sent to all parties and the Court.
- I. Upon the expiration of the abatement period applicable to the case (30 days) the parties will enter into an Agreed Scheduling Order, which will include a date for trial.
- J. The Court shall set a Status Conference to occur on each case under this Order 150 days from the date the Original Petition was filed and provide written notice to all parties of the date and time of the Status Conference.

Signed this Dday of June 1, 2013.

93rd District Court, Judge Imoy Delegato

206th District Court, Judge Rosa Gherra Reyna

275th District Court, Judge Rosa Gherra Reyna

332rd District Court, Judge Juan Partida

370th District Court, Judge Letty Lopez

389th District Court, Judge Letty Lopez

490th District Court, Judge Letty Lopez

490th District Court, Judge Israel Ramon, Jr.

(signatures continued on next page)

398th District Court, JudgetAlda Salinas Flor

92nd District Court, Judge Ricardo Rodriguez, Jr.

EXHIBIT NO. 2

IN RE:	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
HIDALGO HAIL	§ §	
RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY	8	HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS
CLAIM LITIGATION	§ . §	TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

ORDER ASSIGNING CASES FOR PRETRIAL MATTERS CONCERNING HIDALGO COUNTY RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL HAIL CLAIMS

The 93rd, 206th and 370th District Courts of Hidalgo County, Texas, have been assigned to handle all pretrial matters for residential and commercial property insurance cases filed in the District Courts of Hidalgo County, Texas that involve insurance disputes arising out of hail storms that struck Hidalgo County on or about March 29, 2012 and April 20, 2012. The most efficient and consistent manner for allocating the various matters among the three pretrial courts is to divide and assign the cases based on the named insurance carrier defendant. Accordingly, each of the pretrial courts is hereby assigned to handle pretrial matters in the subject Hidalgo County residential and commercial hail claims, as follows:

The 93rd Judicial District Court shall handle all pretrial matters in cases against the following insurance carriers:

- 1. State Farm entities
- 2. Homeowners of America
- 3. National Lloyds
- 4. Fred Loya Insurance
- 5. Standard Guaranty
- 6. Geovera
- 7. Southern Vanguard
- 8. Balboa
- 9. Republic Group
- 10. USAA
- ***ALL OTHER INSURANCE CARRIERS NOT ASSIGNED UNDER THIS ORDER ARE ASSIGNED TO THE 93RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT FOR PRETRIAL MATTERS.***

The 206th Judicial District Court shall handle all pretrial matters in cases against the following insurance carriers:

- 1. Farmers Insurance entities
- 2. Foremost Insurance entities
- 3. Hocheim Prairie
- 4. Certain Underwriters
- 5. Meritplan
- 6. Underwriters at Lloyds
- 7. Scottsdale Insurance Co.
- 8. American Hallmark

- 9. Lloyds of London
- 10. Texas FAIR Plan Association
- 11. Standard Guaranty
- 12. Priority One
- 13. Progressive Insurance Co.
- 14. Lexington
- 15. Nationwide

The 370th Judicial District Court shall handle all pretrial matters in cases against the following insurance carriers:

- 1. Allstate entities
- 2. Wellington
- 3. America First
- 4. Cypress Texas Lloyds
- 5. American Risk
- 6. Germania
- 7. Pronto Insurance Co.
- 8. ASI Lloyds
- 9. Hartford
- 10. Companion
- 11. Frontier
- 12. Safeco
- 13. Travelers
- 14. Liberty Mutual
- 15. Universal
- 16. Ranchers & Farmers

It is further ORDERED that the parties are urged to attempt to agree on discovery matters, including written discovery disputes and the number and scope of depositions. However, if the parties are unable to reach a consensus regarding global or institutional discovery disputes, the presiding administrative judge for Hidalgo County District Courts will work in conjunction with the pre-trial judges to establish uniform parameters for discovery in all cases controlled by this pretrial order.

signed this day

, 2013.

93rd District Court, Judge Rudy D

District Committee Roberto Flores

206 District Court, Judgo Rosa Querra Reyna

(signatures continued on next page)

332nd District Court, Judge Marlo E. Ramirez, Jr.

370th District Court, Judge Noe Gonzalez

389th District Court, Judge Vetry Lopez

430th District Court, Judge Israel Ramon, Jr.

398th District Court, Judge Ada Salinas Flores

92nd District Court, Judge Ricardo Rodriguez, Jr.

Case 7:15-cv-00134 Document 1-1 Filed in TXSD on 04/02/15 Page 27 of 27

CIVIL CASE INFORMATION SHEET

Electronically Filed 3/3/2015 3:26:44 PM Hidalgo County District Clerks Reviewed By: Alexis Bonilla

Cause Number (102	CLERE USE ONLY): C-09	928-1	5-Hco	JURT (FOR	CLERE U	SE ONLY):_	Traviowed by. Alexis borning
STYLED	uco Saenz aka Frank Saen		Nationwide Proper	ty and C	Casualty	y Insura	ance Company
(e.g., John Smith v. All Americas Insurance Co; In re Mary Ann Jones; In the Matter of the Estate of George Jackson) A civil case information sheet must be completed and submitted when an original petition or application is filed to initiate a new civil, family law, probate, or mental health case or when a post-judgment petition for modification or motion for enforcement is filed in a family law case. The information should be the best available at the time of filing.							
de Contact Information to person	completing case information th	ectif .	Nemes of parties in c				for entity completion thee sur-
Name:	Email:		Plaintiff(s)/Petitioner((s):	!	Pro Se	ey for Plaintiff/Petitioner Plaintiff/Petitioner
Nishi Kothari	kothari@simplyjustice	kothari@eimplyjustice.com Francisco Saenz aka Frank					
Address: 1110 Nasa Parkway, Suite	Telephone: a 620 281-532-5529	Saenz			L	al Parties in Child Support Case:	
			Defendant(s)/Respond	dent(s):		Custodial	Parent:
City/State/Zip:	Fex; 281-402-3534		Nationwide Pro	• •	ınd		
Houston, Texas 77058	***************************************		Casualty Insur	rance Co	жрапу	Non-Cust	todial Parent:
Signoture A	State Bar No: 24087862						d Father:
VI)VV			(Attach additional page as acc		II perties)		
Extinuicate case type con identity.	the most important used in the ca Civil	sso (selec	(only)):			Section Section	illy Law
	Hadron Cerating Street Services		0.45319423195445345345	State	到影響		nity Law NPS(L) (denien) Action — ((consttill (V2)) — (sx
Contract Debt/Contract	Injury or Damage	TEN A	Real Property ninent Domain/	Marri	age Role!	onesip	(non (17) is 17(1)
Consumer/DTPA	Construction Defamation	Co	ondemnation		laro Marria	ige Void	Modification—Custody Modification—Other
Fraud/Misrepresentation	Malpractice	Пои	niet Title	□w	Vith Childn	SOURCE MUNICIPALITY	
Other Dobt/Contract:	☐Accounting ☐Legal	Tre	espass to Try Title ther Property:		lo Children	,	☐ Enforcement/Modification ☐ Paternity
Foreclasure	Medical	_	me coper.	i		1	Reciprocals (UIFSA)
Home Equity—Expedited Other Foreclosure	☐Other Professional Liability:						Support Order
Franchise	Motor Vehicle Accident	R	telaled to Criminal Mattern	**************************************	er Family		
☐Landlord/Tenant	Premises		upunction	Enfo	orce Forcig		☐Adoption/Adoption with
☐ Non-Competition ☐ Partnership	Product Liability Asbestos/Silica	☐ No	dgment Nizi un-Disclosure	Habe	gnient cas Corpu		Termination Child Protection
Other Contract:	Other Product Liability List Product:	Sei	rizure/Forfeiture	Nam	ne Change tective Ord	,	Child Support Custody or Visitation
		Pre	re-indictment	Rem	noval of D		☐Gestational Parenting
	Other Injury or Damage:	Out	her:	of M □Othe	Minority er:	!	Grandparent Access Parentage/Paternity
				J			Termination of Parental
Employment				4		1	Rights Other Parent-Child:
Discrimination Retaliation	Administrative Appeal Antitrust/Unfair		wyer Discipline rpetuate Testimony			1	
Termination	Competition	<u>□</u> S∞	curities/Stock	1		,	
☐ Workers' Compensation ☐ Other Employment:	Code Violations Foreign Judgment	∐Ton □Ott	rtious Interference			!	
	Intellectual Property	5				1	
			Probate & M				
☐Tax Appraisal ☐Tax Delinquency	Probate/Wills/Intestate Administration			Guardiansi Guardiansi	ship—Adu		
Other Tax	☐ Independent Administratio			Mental He		л	
	Other Estate Proceedings		L	Othor:			- ·
A fadicate of leading or central							
Appeal from Municipal or Justi		atory Judg	gment		Prejur	dgment Ren ctive Order	nedy
Attachment	Interple	eader		1	Recei	iver	
☐ Bill of Review ☐ Certiorari	☐ License	.mus		1		corary Restri	raining Order/Injunction
Class Action	☐ Post-ju	dgment		- Historian Control	Turno	over	
4. Indicate daimages sorght (do not select if it is a family ten case). Less than \$100,000, including damages of any kind, penalties, costs, expenses, pre-judgment interest, and attorney fees					de la companya de la		
Less than \$100,000 and non-monetary relief							
Over \$100, 000 but not more than \$200,000 Over \$200,000 but not more than \$1,000,000							